

REMARKS

Paragraph 3 of the office action requested a correction of the Abstract. In response the abstract is amended by this response in a manner which it is believed meets all of the requirements mentioned in said paragraph 3. In addition the abstract has been amended to better reflect the subject matter of the claims as amended herein.

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action objected to Claim 15 because of a misspelling. In response Claim 15 has been amended to correct this error.

Paragraph 5 of the office action rejected independent claim 1, and claims 2-3 and 6-18 which depend from it, and independent claim 29, which is an apparatus claim with limitations similar to those of Claim 1. It made this rejection based on the allegation that these claims were obvious in light of Aganovic and Shetter.

In response Claim 1 and 29 have been amended to included the limitations of Claims 2 and 4. Paragraph 6 of the Office Action states Claim 4 contains allowable subject matter. The newly amended Claims 1 and 29 are very similar to Claim 4, rewritten in independent form, except that amended Claims 1 and 29 do not include the limitations of claim 3, which do not appear to be essential to the patentability of Claim 4. None of the art of record show a system for displaying digital content that scales and subpixel optimizes its images and text in the different manner recited in claim 4, and now as recited in Claims 1 and 29. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 29, and all the claims that depend from them are patentable over all the art of record and should be allowed.

Claims 1 and 29, like several of the other prior claims, have been amended to correct minor errors.

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action, as just stated, indicates that Claims 4 and 5 would be allowable if rewriting in independent form. The applicant thanks the Examiner for this indication of allowability.

In response Claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form containing all of the limitations of Claims 1, 2, and 3, from which claim 4 depends. Claim 5 now depends from this independent version of claim 4.

The amendment cancels non-elected claims 19-28. The applicant, of course, reserves the right to file a divisional application to cover the subject matter recited in these claims.

New dependent claim 30 and 31 have been added to create claims that contains limitations similar to those of Claim 5, but which depends from newly amended Claim 1 and 29, respectively. These new claims are similar in scope to claim 5, except that they do not include the limitations of Claim 3.

New independent claims 32 and 35 have been added. These both include the limitations of the original claim 1. In addition, Claim 31 has limitations similar to those in non-elected claim 19, and claim 34 has limitations similar to those of non-elected claim 22. New Claims 33-34 depend from the new independent Claim 32, and new claims 36-39 depend from the new independent Claim 34. These dependent claims have language similar to claims 20-21, and 25-28, respectively.

The undersigned attorney hopes and assumes it is permissible to add limitations to an elected claim, even if the added limitations come from a non-elected claim. But he is not certain whether or not it is proper to do so. The undersigned did a quick scan of relevant sections in the MPEP and did not find any text which appeared to either positively confirm or negate the right to make such a change. The undersigned sought to contact the Examiner and his supervisor on June 26, 2006, by phone, but was not able to do so, presumably because of the heavy rain in the Washington area in the previous 24 hours or so.

If such an amendment is not permissible after a restriction requirement, the undersigned apologizes for his mistake. Otherwise, the undersigned would greatly appreciate it if the Examiners could enter such claims.

With these amendments the application has 5 independent claims and 29 total claims. The application was filed with 4 independent claims and 29 total claims. Thus a fee of \$200.00 is owing for the addition of one additional independent claim. The undersigned attorney hereby authorizes the USPTO to charge the amount of the fee for such an additional claim to the Porter & Associates deposit account, deposit account numbered 502110.

Paragraph 7 noted some relevant aspects of the Makapaa and Ong references. From a quick review of these references it does not appear to the undersigned that they provide any basis for denying the patentability of the current claims pending in this application, as amended herein.

Statements appearing above in respect to the disclosures in the cited reference represent the present opinions of the undersigned attorney and, in the event that the Examiner disagrees with any of such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the respective reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the currently pending claims, that is claims 1-18 and 29-39 are patentable and early allowance of these claims is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Edward W. Porter/

Edward W. Porter
Registration No.28,892
Porter & Associates
24 String Bridge S12
Exeter, NH 03833
(617) 494-1722